



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,948	10/26/2001	Thomas Samuel Zemanian	E-13260	2515

7590 03/28/2003

Douglas E. McKinley, Jr.
McKinley Law Office
P.O. Box 202
Richland, WA 99352

EXAMINER

LOVERING, RICHARD D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1712

2

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/045,948	Applicant(s)	ZEMANIAN ET AL
Examiner	L OVERING	Group Art Unit	1712

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-9 AND 11-25 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - All
 - Some*
 - Noneof the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
 - received.
 - received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit 1712

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Laufer et al. 3,920,865, esp. Examples 1-3, noting also column 4, lines 59-64 which teach that the particles are "aerogel". While Laufer et al. don't explicitly recite that the organopolysiloxane provides a "monolayer" coating on the silica or other aerogel, such a coating can be inferred from column 4, lines 53-58 because patentees disclose chemical reaction of the hydrophobizing agent only with the active surface of the oxide particles.

Serial No. 10/045,948

Art Unit 1712

(Inv 102)

(N)

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laufer et al. above in view of Wirth et al. 5,716,705. The Laufer et al. reference applies as indicated in the preceding paragraph. Even if Laufer et al. did not apply a monolayer coating, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time applicants' invention was made to do so in Examples 1-3 of Laufer et al. in view of the teachings of Wirth et al. (column 1, lines 21-32) to protect the aerogel particles from chemical damage or physical degradation such as cracking. Note that Wirth et al. contemplate applying a monolayer to various materials including silica gel (paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3).

5. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obvious-type or non-obvious-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornam, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78 (d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a Terminal Disclaimer. A Terminal Disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit 1712

out for

6. Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,531,224. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the stated instant claims read on, or at least overlap, the claims of the '224 patent. It is evident from the product-by-process limitations of the patent claims that the products of the '224 patent are made by a supercritical fluid process which involves chemical bonding.

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There are no specific instructions in the disclosure, e.g. temperatures, concentrations, etc., to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to perform the step of hydroetching. (This ground of rejection will be reconsidered when applicants furnish the serial number

Art Unit 1712

and filing date of the copending application referred to on page 6 of the specification.)

9. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record doesn't disclose or fairly suggest the ceramic oxide aerogel having a monolayer coating and the stated pore sizes and bottle necks of claim 10 herein.

*(13) 2 if
cl 13 should depend upon cl 12
Cl 18 & Cl 17
should be allowed*
11. Applicants are required to insert the serial number and filing date of the copending application referred to on page 6 of the specification.

*cl 23, cl 22
Not up to date*
12. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The first line on page 7 of the specification is illegible.

Appropriate correction is required.

13. The remaining references listed on the attached Form PTO-892 are cumulative to the references applied herein, and/or further show the state of the art.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lovering whose telephone number is (703) 308-0443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

Serial No. 10/045,948

-6-

Art Unit 1712

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Dawson, can be reached on (703) 308-2340. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

R. Lovering:cdc
March 19, 2003

Richard D. Lovering
RICHARD D. LOVERING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 171200